

REMARKS

In the Office Action of Paper No. 24, claims 13-16, 19, 20, 23, 26-28, and 41-43 were allowed. Claims 29-40 and 44 were rejected. Of these rejected claims, claim 29 is the only independent claim.

Allowed claims 19, 26 and 27 are amended herein to correct minor errors in the claims and improve their clarity.

Claims 29-32, 34, 40, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the disclosures of the U.S. Patent of Aoyagi No. 3,925,585 and the U.S. Patent of Roth et al. No. 6,410,111. In the rejection of the claims, it was acknowledged that the Aoyagi reference did not disclose a transparent patch layer. The Roth reference was relied on for this disclosure. In the rejection, it was contended that the Roth reference disclosed a peelable layer that is transparent, and that it would be obvious to modify the sticker of Aoyagi with a transparent patch layer as taught by the Roth reference.

Claim 29 has been cancelled herein and its subject matter has been added by amendment to new independent claim 33. The amendment does not further limit claim 33. Independent claim 33 includes the limitation of the patch layer being continuous within the patch layer peripheral edge. It is respectfully submitted that this subject matter of the invention is not taught or suggested by the Aoyagi or Roth references, and the construction of the Aoyagi sticker teaches away from the subject matter of amended claim 33.

In the office action, claim 33 was rejected as being obvious in view of the combined disclosures of the Aoyagi and Roth references, and further in view of the disclosure of the Jameson Patent No. 4,910,054.

It is an essential feature of the Aoyagi reference that there be a cut 4 through the patch layer or sheet 1 which divides the sheet 1 into a clipping 1a of the sheet and an annular piece 1b of the sheet. The cut 4 in the sheet 1 of the Aoyagi reference is essential to the

intended functioning of the sticker described in the reference. It would not be obvious to modify the Aoyagi reference to remove the cut 4 of the sheet 1, as this would negate the intended purpose or use of the Aoyagi sticker.

In contrast to the construction of the Aoyagi sticker, amended claim 33 requires that the printable form of the invention have a transparent patch layer with a peripheral edge extending around the patch layer; an adhesive layer having a peripheral edge extending around the adhesive layer, the adhesive layer being secured to the patch layer; a form layer attached to the adhesive layer; a die cut through the form layer spaced inwardly from the patch layer peripheral edge and inwardly from the adhesive layer peripheral edge; and the patch layer being continuous within the patch layer peripheral edge with there being no die-cuts through the patch layer within the patch layer peripheral edge. This structure of the invention is not disclosed or suggested by the Aoyagi reference, and the Aoyagi references actually teaches away from this structure.

The shortcomings of the Aoyagi reference set forth above are not overcome by the Roth reference or the other prior art of record.

The Jameson reference was relied on in rejecting claim 33 for a disclosure of a continuous patch layer having no die-cuts through the patch layer. However, as set forth above, modifying the Aoyagi patch layer 1 by removing the cut 4 from within the peripheral edge of the layer 1 would negate the intended functioning of the Aoyagi sticker. This would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill. Therefore, it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of the Aoyagi, Roth et al., and Jameson references as contended in the rejection of claim 33 to produce the subject matter of the invention recited in independent claim 33. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 33 is allowable over the prior art of record.


In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 33 and its dependent amendments claims 30-32, 34-40, and 44 are allowable over the prior art.

Claims 35-39 were rejected as being obvious in view of the disclosures of the Aoyagi and Roth et al. references, and further in view of the disclosure of the U.S. Patent of Popat, et al. No. 5,662,976. It is respectfully submitted that the Popat reference does not overcome the shortcomings of the Aoyagi and Roth references set forth earlier, i.e., the Popat reference does not make obvious a continuous patch layer within a peripheral edge of the patch layer. It is therefore submitted that claims 35-39, which are amended herein to depend from new independent claim 33, are allowable over the prior art of record.

New independent claim 45 has been added by this amendment. New independent claim 45 is directed to the construction of the form of the invention shown in Figures 1-3. This construction of the form is not disclosed or suggested in any of the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully submitted that that new independent claim 45 is allowable over the prior art.

In view of the amendments and remarks presents herein, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Thompson Coburn LLP

By: 
Joseph M. Rolnicki
Reg. No. 32,653
One US Bank Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63101-1693
(314) 552-6286